

11/24/69

Dear Bud,

Herewith the goodies I referred to Friday. You will note in my correspondence I make no mention of what interests me most. Having forced this out I see nothing to be gained by announcing I read it loud and clear. I intend making no mention of this until the proper time and hope you also will not. But, added to what I have already shown you, I think this can, properly handled, be as nothing we have yet had. I'll talk to you before we see Speiser, but I would agree to let him know, for it should be powerful there.

My letters should speak for themselves. I'll point out only a few of the more pertinent things about the other enclosures. Sorry some of the copies are so poor. The machine was in worse than usual shape part of the time. The originals are in an auto sy file and we can duplicate them at any time.

There is nothing like a denial of the existence of the Kellerman receipt. Rather there is the archives-like evasion, we don't have it.

It must be obvious this proves they lied to me in saying they didn't have what they did and now provide. It also must be obvious that this is a violation of Clark's executive order. Furthermore you have a letter to me from Rowley which now clearly is false. I would hope this would impress a judge as it should the public.

The reverse side of the certificate of death has blanks to be filled in but none are.

The 11/26 memo goes much farther than Mack acknowledged. I wonder what there was four days later to inspire this and to whom it was sent. It would seem the name of the addressee was added in each case. It relates to what followed the body examination, to after the completion of the autopsy.

It is not by accident that Burkley used the word "verified" relating to the back wound. He is much more specific in his certificate of death (and why did he execute it rather than the prosecutors?). He refers to the wound in the "posterior back" and locates it "at about the level of the third thoracic vertebra." Consistent with everything else except the perjury, which now, clearly, is nothing else-not accident, certainly. He introduces questions about the head wound that may be no more than imprecision, but should not automatically be passed off as no more.

The Sibert-O'Neill receipt is inappropriate for CE 843. I have difficulty deciding why Clark's 11/23 was eliminated. This has worried me for years, and I've even consulted the printers' set seeking an answer. It cannot be innocent, therefore we shall have to seek what this deception was intended to obscure.

Like to talk to you about these when there is time. I'll try and mail tonight so you can have before Thanksgiving.

Sincerely,